Schnell Recreation Area
Visitor Survey

Introduction

In order for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to comply with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), and better meet the needs of the public; a visitor satisfaction survey was conducted at 12 BLM recreation sites in 8 states during fiscal year 2005 (FY05). The survey was developed to measure each site’s performance related to BLM GPRA Goal 3.1 - Provide for a quality recreation experience, including access, and enjoyment of natural and cultural resources on DOI managed and partnered lands and waters; and Goal 3.2 - Provide for and receive fair value in recreation. The information collected during the survey will also help the BLM better serve the public. The survey collected visitor satisfaction data regarding visitor information (i.e., use of maps, signs, brochures), developed facilities, managing recreation use, resource management, BLM staff and customer service, and educational and interpretive materials.

The results of the visitor satisfaction survey conducted at Schnell Recreation Area are summarized in this data report. A description of the research methods and limitations can be found on the next page. Below (left) is a graph summarizing visitor opinions of the “overall quality of recreation experience.” The satisfaction measure next to this graph is a combined percentage of “good” and “very good” responses. This is the primary performance measure for GPRA Goal 3.1 and should be used for reporting performance. for this goal (NOTE: the satisfaction measure may not equal the sum of “very good” and “good” percentages due to rounding).

The response rate for this site survey was 100%. The graph and satisfaction measure summarizing visitor opinions of the “value for fee paid”, which is the primary performance measure for GPRA Goal 3.2, can be found on page 9.

Overall quality of recreation experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY05: 29 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05 GPRA Satisfaction Measure
Percentage of site visitors satisfied overall with appropriate facilities, services, and recreational opportunities:

100%
Understanding the Results

Inside this report are graphs that illustrate the survey results. The report contains 8 categories of data regarding BLM amenities, staff, and services plus selected demographics. Within these categories are graphs for each indicator evaluated by site visitors. For example, the Visitor Information category includes indicators such as “providing useful maps and brochures,” “adequate signs on site for direction,” and so forth. In each category there is a graph entitled “Everything Considered” this graph is the basis for determining visitor satisfaction for each category and GPRA reporting numbers.

Each graph includes the following information:

• The number of visitor responses for the indicator;
• The percentage of responses which were “very good,” “good,” “average,” “poor,” and “very poor;”
• A “satisfaction measure” that combines the percentage of total responses which were “very good” or “good;” and
• An average evaluation score (mean score) based on the following values: very poor= 1, poor= 2, average= 3, good= 4, very good= 5.

The higher the average evaluation score, the more positive the visitor response
• Graph percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding

Research Methods

Surveys were distributed to a random sample of visitors at this site during a selected period in FY05. The survey response rate is described on the first page of this report, meaning that 100% of those randomly sampled responded to the survey. The data reflect visitor opinions about this site’s facilities, management, services, educational opportunities, and fees during the survey period. Visitor activities and selected demographics were also captured. A representative sample of the general visitor population were surveyed at selected locations. The results do not necessarily apply to visitors during other times of the year, or visitors who did not visit the survey locations on site.

Returned surveys were electronically scanned and the data analyzed. Frequency distributions were calculated for each indicator and category. All percentage calculations were rounded to the nearest percent.

The survey response rate is described on the first page of this report. The sample size (n) varies from figure to figure, depending on the number of responses.

Caution is advised when interpreting any data with a sample size of less than 30. In such cases, the word “CAUTION!” is included in the graph. This report excludes any indicator with less than 10 responses.

For most indicators, the survey data are expected to be accurate within ± 6% with 95% confidence. This means that if different samples had been drawn, the results would have been similar (±6%) 95 out of 100 times.

For more information about this survey, contact Jennifer Hoger, BLM Survey Project Coordinator at the University of Idaho Park Studies Unit (208) 885-4806
Primary activities

| Activity                      | FY05: 26 respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/walking</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized boating</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized boating/rfting</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized recreation vehicles</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and interpretation</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwatching/wildlife viewing</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Percentages do not equal 100 because visitors could choose more than one activity.

CAUTION!

Primary Activities at this Site/Area

Visitor Information

Providing adequate signs on site for direction and orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY05: 28 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAUTION!

Providing useful maps and brochures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY05: 28 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAUTION!

Ensuring public awareness of rules and regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY05: 25 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everything considered: quality of BLM visitor information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>FY05: 25 respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 96%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.4

FY05: Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.6
Schnell Recreation Area
Developed Facilities

Maintaining roads for motorized vehicles
FY05: 27 respondents
Very good: 6%
Good: 64%
Average: 7%
Poor: 5%
Very poor: 0%
CAUTION!
Rating

Maintaining a clean site
FY05: 26 respondents
Very good: 76%
Good: 25%
Average: 0%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%
CAUTION!
Rating

FY05
Satisfaction measure: 93%
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Maintaining trails for non-motorized use
FY05: 24 respondents
Very good: 11%
Good: 29%
Average: 4%
Poor: 3%
Very poor: 0%
CAUTION!
Rating

Maintaining cleanliness of restrooms and other physical facilities
FY05: 25 respondents
Very good: 77%
Good: 26%
Average: 0%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%
CAUTION!
Rating

FY05
Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Everything considered: overall condition of developed facilities
FY05: 27 respondents
Very good: 96%
Good: 3%
Average: 0%
Poor: 0%
Very poor: 0%
CAUTION!
Rating

FY05
Satisfaction measure: 100%
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Schnell Recreation Area
Fees

Total fees paid
FY05: 28 respondents
No fees: 71%
Under $25: 25%
$25-$50: 4%
> $50: 0%
CAUTION!
Amount spent

How appropriate was the fee charged for this site/area?
FY05: 8 respondents
Very poor: 0%
Poor: 26%
Average: 67%
Good: 0%
Very good: 0%
CAUTION!
Rating

The value of the recreation opportunity was at least equal to the fee asked to pay.
FY05: 7 respondents
Very poor: 0%
Poor: 0%
Average: 0%
Good: 25%
Very good: 75%
EXCLUDED
Rating
Everything considered: visitor and recreation management

Everything considered: interpretive and educational program

Providing information about resource preservation and management in this area

Providing stewardship information on how to protect the cultural and natural resources

Should the BLM provide more educational and interpretive material about this area’s resources?

Schnell Recreation Area
Provisioning Educational and Interpretive Material

Providing quality educational and interpretive material about the resources at this site

Managing the most appropriate use of vehicles

Managing the appropriate use of vehicles

Managing the number of people

CAUTION!

CAUTION!

CAUTION!

CAUTION!

CAUTION!

CAUTION!

CAUTION!

CAUTION!

CAUTION!

CAUTION!

CAUTION!

CAUTION!
Adequately protecting the natural resources
FY05: 26 respondents
Very good: 20%  
Good: 14%  
Average: 5%  
Poor: 14%  
Very poor: 20%
CAUTION!
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 100%  
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Ensuring that visitor activities do not infringe on resource protection
FY05: 20 respondents
Very good: 40%  
Good: 15%  
Average: 5%  
Poor: 40%  
Very poor: 0%
CAUTION!
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 95%  
Average evaluation score: 4.7

Everything considered: BLM protection
of natural and cultural resources
FY05: 17 respondents
Very good: 20%  
Good: 12%  
Average: 2%  
Poor: 6%  
Very poor: 60%
CAUTION!
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 94%  
Average evaluation score: 4.6

Adequately protecting the cultural resources
FY05: 24 respondents
Very good: 40%  
Good: 15%  
Average: 5%  
Poor: 17%  
Very poor: 25%
CAUTION!
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 100%  
Average evaluation score: 4.8

Everything considered: performance of BLM staff
FY05: 26 respondents
Very good: 35%  
Good: 38%  
Average: 2%  
Poor: 11%  
Very poor: 8%
CAUTION!
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 100%  
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Staff treated me courteously
FY05: 23 respondents
Very good: 72%  
Good: 25%  
Average: 2%  
Poor: 0%  
Very poor: 0%
CAUTION!
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 100%  
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Staff demonstrated knowledge about the natural and cultural resources in the area
FY05: 22 respondents
Very good: 94%  
Good: 7%  
Average: 0%  
Poor: 0%  
Very poor: 0%
CAUTION!
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 100%  
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Staff demonstrated knowledge about recreational opportunities in the area
FY05: 24 respondents
Very good: 68%  
Good: 17%  
Average: 8%  
Poor: 8%  
Very poor: 0%
CAUTION!
FY05: Satisfaction measure: 100%  
Average evaluation score: 4.9

Everything considered: satisfaction measure
FY05: 100%  
Average evaluation score: 4.7

FY05: 95%  
Average evaluation score: 4.7

FY05: 94%  
Average evaluation score: 4.6

FY05: 100%  
Average evaluation score: 4.8

FY05: 100%  
Average evaluation score: 4.9

FY05: 100%  
Average evaluation score: 4.9

FY05: 100%  
Average evaluation score: 4.9